



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/612,257

07/01/2003

Christine Chen

021756-000100US

3331

51206

7590

05/28/2009

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
8TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

BOYCE, ANDRE D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/28/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/612,257	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Andre Boyce	<b>Art Unit</b> 3623	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. This Final office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed January 28, 2009. Claims 1, 14 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending.
2. The previously pending objection to the abstract has been withdrawn  
The previously pending rejections to claims 14-20 under 35 USC 101 have been withdrawn.  
The previously pending rejections to claims 1-20 under 35 USC 102(b) based upon a public use or sale of the invention has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments filed January 28, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1).  
Regarding to claim 1, Ojha et al. discloses the method of updating a supply plan used to process customer requests in an available-to-promise (ATP) system (paragraph [0003], lines 9-11), the method comprising: a supply chain planning

Art Unit: 3623

component updating a model of a supply chain (i.e. planning information) (paragraph [0006], lines 13-16 and paragraph [0027], lines 11-19) for one or more products sold by the ATP system (paragraph [0003], lines 11-14); the supply chain planning component copying (i.e. replicating) a current supply plan used by the ATP system to process customer requests to create a second supply plan (paragraph [0027], lines 19-22); thereafter, receiving a first plurality of customers requests at the ATP system and processing orders from the requests against the current supply plan (paragraph [0006], lines 7-9) while running the model of the supply chain with the second supply plan (i.e. uninterrupted service) as part of a process that creates a new (i.e. updated) supply plan (paragraph [0008], lines 8-13); after the new supply plan is created, a synchronization program synchronizing the new supply plan by processing orders from the first plurality of customer requests scheduled against the current supply plan into the new supply plan (paragraph [0046], lines 1-4), wherein the synchronizing process is stopped prior to synchronizing all the orders in the first plurality of requests into the new supply plan (instruct operating HA systems to terminate processing, step 216, and generation of a stop record indicating the last processed order and termination of operation of operating HA systems, step 218 in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); thereafter, temporarily stopping promising orders while synchronizing all remaining orders from the first plurality of requests not synchronized during the synchronizing process in the new supply plan (generating a stop record indicating the last order that was processed, step 218 and processing any remaining pre-termination orders and update ATP supply information, step 222,

Art Unit: 3623

as seen in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); and after the remaining orders from the first plurality of requests are processed, replacing the current supply plan with the new (i.e. updated) supply plan so that the ATP system processes future customer requests against the new (i.e. updated) supply plan (paragraph [0017], lines 6-10 and paragraph [0050], lines 6-12).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bush Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,486,899 B1).

Regarding to claim 2, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not disclose changing a pointer to the new supply plan and setting a flag associated with the new supply plan to indicate that the new supply plan is available for ATP processing. Bush Jr. teaches using notifications flags to display logistic information relating to supply plans (i.e. entities or distribution resources) in the supply chain (column 5, lines 6-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the feature of changing a pointer to the new supply plan and setting a flag associated with the new supply plan, as both Ojha et al. and Bush Jr. are directed to the method of updating a supply plan. The

Art Unit: 3623

motivation for doing so would have been to indicate that the new supply plan is available for ATP processing.

8. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of AMR Consulting White Paper: "Planning for Tomorrow: A Tactical Approach to Supply Chain Innovation" (hereafter referred to as AMR Consulting).

Regarding to claims 3-5, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not disclose an exception is generated (as per claim 3) and causes a message (as per claim 4) to be sent to a planner (as per claim 5) for processing if a promise made against the current supply plan cannot be made against the new supply plan. However, AMR Consulting teaches an exception causing a message to be generated (i.e. automatic notification) and sent to a planner (i.e. decision makers) for processing if a promise made against the current supply plan cannot be made against the new supply plan (i.e. when business events diverge from planning targets) (page 18, paragraph 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the feature of an exception (as per claim 3) to cause a message to be generated (as per claim 4) and sent to a planner for processing (as per claim 5) as taught by AMR Consulting, as both Ojha et al. and AMR Consulting are directed to the method of updating a supply plan. The

Art Unit: 3623

motivation for doing so would have been to notify a planner if a promise made against the current supply plan cannot be made against the new supply plan.

9. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brichta (U.S. Pat. No. 5,864,483).

Regarding to claim 6 and 7, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not explicitly disclose stopping synchronization when it is determined that a predetermined number of requests still need to be synchronized (as per claim 6), wherein the predetermined number is calculated by a system based on an average time of synchronizing each request and a desired system downtime entered by a planner (as per claim 7). Brichta teaches alerting a planner (i.e. provider) when services or products are approaching unacceptable levels relative to predetermined number of requests (i.e. predetermined criteria) (column 1, lines 61-66), wherein the predetermined number (i.e. predetermined criteria) is calculated by a system (column 7, lines 10-14) using statistical information including average time (i.e. mean) (column 2, lines 2-13, column 7, lines 20-28) based on each request and a desired system downtime (i.e. service information) (column 7, lines 14-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the feature of stopping synchronization (i.e. appropriate action) (column 2, lines 14-17) when it is determined that a predetermined number of

Art Unit: 3623

requests still need to be synchronized (as per claim 6), wherein the predetermined number is calculated by a system based on an average time (i.e. mean) of synchronizing each request and a desired system downtime entered by a planner (i.e. provider) (as per claim 7). The motivation for doing so would be to synchronize all the number of requests.

10. Claims 8 and 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Syed et al. (U.S. Pat. No. RE39,549 E).

Regarding to claim 8, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not disclose prior to running the model, capturing a snapshot of data representing actual sales and promised requests for use in the creation of the new supply plan. Syed et al. teaches obtaining a snapshot time from a database server to return data that reflects a database state associated with the snapshot time (column 1, lines 64-67 to column 2, lines 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the feature of capturing a snapshot of data representing actual sales and promised requests as taught by Syed et al., as both Ojha et al. and Syed et al. are directed to the method of updating a supply plan. The motivation for doing so would have been to create a new supply plan.



Art Unit: 3623

Regarding to claim 9, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not disclose creating a summary table from the new supply plan that can be used by the ATP system to quickly retrieve summarized availability information without computing availability from more detailed supply and demand tables. Syed et al. teaches relational database storing data in tables (column 5, lines 12-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the feature of creating a summary table (i.e. subset of the table) (column 5, lines 47-52) from the new supply plan as taught by Syed et al., as both Ojha et al. and Syed et al. are directed to the method of updating a supply plan. The motivation for doing so would have been to quickly retrieve summarized availability information without computing availability from more detailed supply and demand tables.

11. Claims 10, 11, 14, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1).

Regarding to claim 10, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Ojha et al. discloses pre-allocating products available (i.e. forecasts of future customer demand) (paragraph [0003], lines 5-11). However, Ojha et al. does not explicitly teach pre-allocating products available for promising in the new supply plan. It is common knowledge in the prior art that organizations previously define business objectives. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

Art Unit: 3623

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to pre-allocate products available for promising to both the current and new supply plan. The motivation for doing so would be to better meet customer demand.

Regarding to claim 11, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Ojha et al. discloses after switching (i.e. replacing) (paragraph [0006], lines 21-22) to the new supply plan, promising orders from the requests against the new supply plan (paragraph [0004], lines 3-6). However, Ojha et al. does not explicitly disclose receiving and promising a second plurality of customers request by the ATP system against the new supply plan. It is common knowledge in the prior art that a second plurality of requests is received after the first plurality of request once the supply plan is switched (i.e. replaced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive and promise orders from a second plurality of requests by the ATP system after the supply plan is switched (i.e. replaced) against the new supply plan. The motivation for doing so would be to promise customer requests against the current and new supply plan without interruptions in service.

Regarding to claim 14, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Ojha et al. teaches the method of managing available-to-promise sales orders (paragraph [0003], lines 1-5), the method comprising: receiving a first plurality of requests from customers before creating a new supply plan; and promising orders (paragraph [0004], lines 3-6) from the first plurality of requests against a first supply plan (paragraph [0006], lines 1-7); creating a new supply plan (i.e. modifying)

Art Unit: 3623

(paragraph [0006], lines 7-9); receiving requests from customers (i.e. uninterrupted service) while the new supply plan is being created (paragraph [0008], lines 8-13); promising orders from the requests against the first supply plan (paragraph [0004], lines 3-6); synchronizing a first portion of the first plurality of requests between the first supply plan and the new supply plan (paragraph [0046], lines 1-4); stopping synchronization after synchronizing the first portion of the first plurality of requests between the first supply plan and the new supply plan (instruct operating HA systems to terminate processing, step 216, and generation of a stop record indicating the last processed order and termination of operation of operating HA systems, step 218 in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); temporarily stopping processing orders while processing a second portion of the first plurality of requests between the first supply plan and the new supply plan and while: processing the second plurality of requests (generating a stop record indicating the last order that was processed, step 218 and processing any remaining pre-termination orders and update ATP supply information, step 222, as seen in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); invalidating (i.e. terminating) the first supply plan and activating (i.e. take over) the new supply plan (paragraph [0017], lines 6-10 and paragraph [0050], lines 6-12); receiving requests from customers, and promising orders from the requests against the new supply plan (paragraph [0004], lines 3-6 and paragraph [0035], lines 15-20). However, Ojha et al. does not explicitly disclose receiving a second and third plurality of requests from customers, wherein the second plurality of requests is received after the first plurality of requests, the third plurality of requests is received after the second plurality of

Art Unit: 3623

requests and after the first supply plan is invalidated and the new supply plan is activated; promising orders from the second plurality of requests against the first supply plan, and promising orders from the third plurality of requests against the new supply plan. It is common knowledge in the prior art that a second plurality of requests is received after the first plurality of request; the third plurality of requests is received after the second plurality of requests. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the second plurality of requests received after the first plurality of requests, the third plurality of requests received after the second plurality of requests; and promising orders from the second plurality of requests against the first supply plan, and promising orders from the third plurality of requests against the new supply plan (paragraph [0004], lines 3-6). The motivation for doing so would be to promise customer requests against both the current and new supply plan.

Regarding to claim 15, Ojha et al. teaches copying (i.e. replicating) the first supply plan and creating the new supply plan from the copy (i.e. replicate) of the first supply plan (paragraph [0027], lines 19-22).

Regarding to claim 19, Ojha et al. teaches the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not explicitly disclose synchronizing a first subset of the second plurality of requests scheduled against the old supply plan into the new supply plan (i.e. modified plan) by processing the second plurality of request against the new supply plan. It is common knowledge in the prior art that a second plurality of requests is received after the first plurality of request. Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 3623

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to synchronize a first subset of the second plurality of requests scheduled against the old supply plan into the new supply plan (i.e. modified plan) by processing the second plurality of request against the new supply plan (paragraph [0006], lines 1-20). The motivation for doing so would have been to update the supply plan.

Regarding to claim 20, Ojha et al. teaches temporarily stopping promising orders (i.e. not online) (paragraph [0045], lines 6-11 and paragraph [0048], lines 1-4); and synchronizing all remaining requests from the second plurality of requests not synchronized during the synchronizing the first subset (paragraph [0050], lines 12-21).

12. Claim 12, 13 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Aram (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0072988 A1).

Regarding to claim 12, 13, 16 and 18, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Ojha et al. teaches the method of updating a supply plan and available-to-promise system for processing customer requests, the system comprising: a supply chain planning component (i.e. Advanced Planning and Scheduling engine) configured to allow a planner to update (i.e. modify) (paragraph [006], lines 1-9) a model of a supply chain (i.e. planning information) for one or more products sold by the ATP system paragraph (paragraph [0003], lines 11-14); an

Art Unit: 3623

order promising component (i.e. Advanced Planning and Scheduling engine) configured to allow a planner to update an old supply plan used to process requests with a new supply plan (paragraph [0006], lines 13-16, paragraph [0008], lines 8-13) by (i) copying (i.e. replicating) a current supply plan used by the ATP system to process customer requests to create a second supply plan (paragraph [0027], lines 19-22); (ii) thereafter, receiving a first plurality of customer requests at the ATP system and promising orders from the first plurality of requests against the current supply plan (paragraph [0006], lines 7-9) while the ATP system runs the model of the supply chain process with the second supply plan (i.e. uninterrupted service) as part of a process that creates a new supply plan (paragraph [0008], lines 8-13); (iii) after the new supply plan is created, synchronizing orders from the first plurality of customer requests scheduled against the current supply plan into the new supply plan (paragraph [0046], lines 1-4); thereafter, temporarily stopping promising orders from new customer requests received at the ATP system while checking all remaining orders from the first plurality of requests not checked during the synchronizing process against the new supply plan (generating a stop record indicating the last order that was processed, step 218 and processing any remaining pre-termination orders and update ATP supply information, step 222, as seen in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); and (v) after the remaining orders from the first plurality of requests are processed, switching the new plan supply for the current supply plan so that the ATP system can process future customer requests against the new supply plan (paragraph [0017], lines 6-10 and paragraph [0050], lines 6-12). However

Art Unit: 3623

Ojha et al. does not disclose processing a first subset of the plurality of customer requests against the new supply plan until a threshold number of orders in the first plurality of requests is reaches (as per claim 16), stopping the synchronizing process when a number of outstanding orders not synchronized into the new plan reaches a threshold number of orders in the first plurality of requests (as per claim 12), wherein the threshold number is a user defined limit (as per claim 13 and 18). Aram teaches assisting identification at which there is a risk of a level of outstanding orders (i.e. customer demand data) falling below a threshold value (paragraph [0065], lines 1-12), wherein the outstanding orders (i.e. customer demand data) is a user defined threshold (i.e. input by user) (paragraph [0066], lines 3-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to combine the method taught by Ojha et al. with the feature processing a first subset of the plurality of customer requests against the new supply plan until a threshold number of orders in the first plurality of requests is reaches (as per claim 16), stopping the synchronizing process when a number of outstanding orders not synchronized into the new plan reaches a threshold number of orders in the first plurality of requests (as per claim 12), wherein the threshold number is a user defined limit (as per claim 13 and 18) as taught by Aram, as both Ojha et al. and Aram are directed to the method of updating a supply plan. The motivation for doing so would be to synchronize all orders into the new supply plan.

Regarding to claim 17, Ojha et al. discloses a demand planning component (i.e. demand fulfillment engine) configured to allow a planner to create a demand plan

Art Unit: 3623

(paragraph [0019], lines 7-14 and paragraph [0024], lines 10-14) that can be used by the supply chain planning component to model a supply chain (paragraph [0019], lines 14-18).

### ***Response to Arguments***

13. In the Remarks, with respect to independent claims 1, 14 and 16, Applicant argues that Ojha et al fails to disclose wherein the synchronizing process is stopped prior to synchronizing all the orders in the first plurality of requests into the new supply plan. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's interpretation of Ojha et al. Ojha et al discloses instruct operating HA systems to terminate processing, step 216, and generation of a stop record indicating the last processed order and termination of operation of operating HA systems, step 218, as seen in figure 5 and ¶ 0050. As such, Ojha et al indeed discloses wherein the synchronizing process is stopped prior to synchronizing all the orders in the first plurality of requests into the new supply plan. Moreover, Ojha et al disclose generating a stop record indicating the last order that was processed, step 218 and processing any remaining pre-termination orders and update ATP supply information, step 222, as seen in figure 5 and ¶ 0050. As such, Ojha et al indeed disclose temporarily stopping promising orders while synchronizing all remaining orders from the first plurality of requests not synchronized during the synchronizing process in the new supply plan.



With respect to claim 14, Applicant also argues "...it appears that the Examiner is taking Official Notice on page 13 of the Office Action. So as not to waive any rights, the Applicants assert that the Examiner is using personal knowledge in taking Official Notice. Therefore, Applicant requests an affidavit from the Examiner in conformance with 37 CFR 1.104 to support the Examiner's assertion that the material of claim 14 was well known."

Applicant's attempt to traverse the Examiner's alleged use of Official Notice fails because it is both untimely and nonmeritorious. With respect to timeliness, Applicant failed to adequately rebut the Examiner's alleged taking of Official Notice in its remarks filed 8/05/08, since Applicant failed to even mention the alleged taking of Official Notice with respect to claim 14, thus failing to "specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating *why* the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art." Moreover, as seen in the Remarks filed 8/05/08, with respect to claim 14, "[a] general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without any reference to the examiner's assertion of official notice would be inadequate." See MPEP § 2144.03(C).

As such, if Applicant fails to challenge the Examiner's notice and it is clear that he has been given ample opportunity to make such challenge, the Examiner's finding will be considered conclusive. *In re Ahlert*, 424 F.2d 1088, 1091-92 (CCPA 1970). Thus, as of 8/05/08, the limitations in which the Examiner allegedly took

Art Unit: 3623

Official Notice became admitted prior art. As such, the Examiner considers any traversals submitted after the date of admission to be untimely and ineffective.

***Conclusion***

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (571)272-6726. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andre Boyce/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623  
May 24, 2009